

## REMARKS

In the Office Action of January 9, 2008, the specification was objected to because the abstract of the disclosure does not commence on a separate sheet in accordance with 37 CFR 1.52(b)(4). Thus, the Office Action has required a new abstract of the disclosure that commences on a separate sheet. In addition, the Office Action has noted some errors in the current abstract of the disclosure. Furthermore, the Office Action has required section headings, as suggested in 37 CFR 1.77(b). The Office Action has also rejected claims 1, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention because of the use of the term “intended.” Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,363,105 B1 (hereinafter “Sourour et al.”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 7,039,134 B1 (hereinafter “Avital et al.”).

With respect to the objection to the specification regarding the abstract, Applicants have replaced the original abstract with a new abstract that commences on a separate sheet. The errors in the original abstract have been corrected in the new abstract. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

With respect to the objection to the specification regarding section headings, Applicants respectfully decline to add the section headings because the suggestions provided in 37 C.F.R. § 1.77(b) are not statutorily required for filing a non-provisional patent application under 35 USC § 111(a), but per 37 C.F.R. § 1.51(d) are only guidelines that are suggested for Applicants’ use. The section headings are not mandatory, and in fact when Rule 77 was amended in 1996 (61 FR 42790, Aug. 19, 1996), Bruce A. Lehman, Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, stated in the Official Gazette:

“Section 1.77 is permissive rather than mandatory. ... 1.77 merely expresses the Office's preference for the arrangement of the application elements. The Office may advise an applicant that the application does not comply with the format set forth in 1.77, and suggest this format for the applicant's

consideration; however, the Office will not require any application to comply with the format set forth in 1.77.”

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully decline to amend the specification to include the suggested section headings and request that this specification objection be withdrawn.

With respect to the Section 112, second paragraph, rejections of claims 1, 12 and 13, Applicants have amended these claims to overcome the Section 112 rejections. In particular, the claim term “intended” has been replaced with “configured” in some instances. In other instances, the claim term “intended” has been replaced with “being used.” In view of the claim amendments, Applicants respectfully assert that these rejections are no longer applicable, and thus, request that the Section 112, second paragraph, rejections to claims 1, 12 and 13 be withdrawn.

With respect to the Section 103 rejections of claim 1-13, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1, 12 and 13 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references of Sourour et al. and Avital et al. Claims 1-13 have also been amended to remove reference letters in parentheses. As amended, the independent claims 1, 12 and 13 are not obvious in view of the cited references of Sourour et al. and Avital et al., as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of pending claims 1-13.

#### A. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1, 12 and 13

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites the limitation of “*each of the delay sub-lines including a memory area to receive at least one sample from the series of samples,*” which is not disclosed in the cited references of Sourour et al. and Avital et al. Consequently, the amended independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Sourour et al. and Avital et al.

The Office Action on pages 6 and 7 states that the cited reference of Sourour et al. discloses “A receiver...characterized in that the delay line (D\_LINE) is intended to delay said input signal by a series of delays ( $\tau$ ) and is divided into a series of delay sub-lines (ZONE) [fig 8A, element 606, col 5, line 14]...” Thus, the Office Action has presumably equated the claimed “delay sub-lines” with different paths provided by the delay taps 606 of Sourour et al. However, these different paths shown in Fig. 8A of Sourour et al. do not include any memory area. Thus, the cited reference of Sourour et al. does not disclose the limitation of “*each of the delay sub-lines including a memory area to receive at least one sample from the series of samples,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Consequently, the amended independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Sourour et al. and Avital et al.

Applicants note herein that the correlator 224 in Fig. 8 of Avital et al., which was cited as being equivalent to the claimed “*control means,*” is not described as being “*configured to generate read addresses of the samples in the delay sub-lines from the series of samples of the input signal,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Thus, the claimed “*control means*” recited in the amended independent claim 1 is not disclosed in the cited reference of Avital et al., which further supports the conclusion that the amended independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Sourour et al. and Avital et al.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claims 12 and 13, which recite similar limitations as those of the amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the amended independent claims 12 and 13 are also not obvious in view of the cited references of Sourour et al. and Avital et al., and request that these amended independent claims be allowed as well.

#### B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-11

Each of the dependent claims 2-11 depends on the amended independent claim 1. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of the amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the amended independent claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Ardichvili et al.

Date: January 9, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/  
Thomas H. Ham  
Registration No. 43,654  
Telephone: (925) 249-1300